

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/386,339	Applicant(s) KATSURABAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit 3623	<i>H6</i>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JACKIE SPONG

(2) Eric Shaffer

(3) Romain Jeanty

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 4/22/03

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic, b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Brooks (US Pat 5,825,869)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative argued that Brooks does not teach the extraction of a plurality of documents generated by one operator. An update search is required.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

will be performed when applicant's representative files a formal amendment. A new office action (non-final) will be issued. The examiner agrees that Brooks does not disclose the claimed invention.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Romain Jeanty
Examiner's signature, if required